

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 10-14, 16-20 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Kumar et al (U.S. Patent 7,065,597), hereinafter "Kumar" and Koike (U.S. Patent 7,081,806), hereinafter "Koike". Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Kumar and Koike as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Scott et al (U.S. Patent 5,311,596), hereinafter "Scott". Applicant submits that no new matter was introduced in the amendment of the claims. Claims 11 and 12 have been cancelled and claim 10 has been amended.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 10-14, 16-20 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Kumar and Koike. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Kumar and Koike as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Scott.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1 in view of the cited references. On page 5 of the office action it was stated that "it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time invention was made to include Koike's infrared communication into AAPA and Kumar's system for the benefit of providing sufficient security for protecting the key information from being intercepted when transferring". Except for hindsight reconstruction of the claim, there is no suggestion in the references of combining Koike's remote infrared system with the combination of AAPA and Kumar's system as mentioned in the office action. An artisan having common sense at the time of the invention would not have reasonably considered embedding an infrared remote control system (e.g., portable keyboard to computer or a TV to wireless handheld remote control) as taught by Koike in order to replace a secondary bus as taught by Kumar. Furthermore, it already had been mentioned in page 4 of the office action as a reason for the combination of Kumar with the mentioned AAPA, that Kumar would ensure that only the destined component would be able to receive the public/private key. What further suggestion or

motivation would there be for one of ordinary skill to add a light based communication system as recited in claim 1 to the combination of Kumar and AAPA if Kumar's sideband channel *already* ensured that the destination component would be the only component to receive the communications as mentioned in the office action? Furthermore, Koike does not add any further suggestion for ensuring a defined positional relationship between the components, since Kumar in FIG. 1 uses a general purpose bus line 114 which would require I/O controller 108 and bridge 114 to be in close range proximity to each other. In the present application, the use of a light based communication as recited in claim 1 provides, for example, for two electronic components within a computer housing such as an adapter card and the computer's mother board (see for example Fig. 4) to communicate with each other only if the adapter card is in a defined positional relationship to the computer motherboard electronics, which is only achievable if the adapter card is plugged into the appropriate I/O socket within the computer. Applicants respectfully believe there was no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Koike.

Given the above comments, it is believed that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for claim 1; therefore claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-3 and 30 which add further nonobvious features to claim 1 are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Independent claim 17 and claims 18-20, 23 and 32 which depend on claim 17 are also believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to further recite in part:

*“wherein the first component comprises an electronic device mounted on a computer motherboard and the second component comprises a plug-in board that plugs into an I/O slot located on the computer motherboard,
and wherein the second light based communication channel enables transmission of said datum between said first component and said second component only when said second component is plugged into the I/O slot thereby establishing a defined positional orientation between the first and second components”*

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2912/305777.02
Application No.: 10/759,325
Office Action Dated: December 12, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

The rejection of independent claim 10 is traversed for the same reasons mentioned for claim 1 above, and further given that none of the cited references taken individually or in combination teach or suggest “*wherein the first component comprises an electronic device mounted on a computer motherboard and the second component comprises a plug-in board that plugs into an I/O slot located on the computer motherboard, and wherein the second light based communication channel enables transmission of said datum between said first component and said second component only when said second component is plugged into the I/O slot thereby establishing a defined positional orientation between the first and second components*”. Support for this amendment can be found in for example FIG. 4 and the corresponding text found in the specification at paragraph [0045] of the present application. In view of the above, claim 10 and dependent claims 13-14, 16 and 31 which depend on independent claim 10 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2912/305777.02
Application No.: 10/759,325
Office Action Dated: December 12, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: March 12, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/
Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439